DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 481 619 EA 032 823

AUTHOR	Murphy, Joseph
TITLE	Reculturing Educational Leadership: The ISLLC Standards Ten Years Out.
INSTITUTION	National Policy Board for Educational Administration, Fairfax, VA.
PUB DATE	2003-09-00
NOTE	60p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 801 North Quincy St., Suite 700, Arlington, VA 22203-1730. Tel: 703-875-0771; Fax: 703-528-2146; e-mail: dgi@aacte.nche.edu; Web site: http://www.npbea.org. For full text: http://www.npbea.org/Resources/ILLC_10_years_9-03.pdf.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Principles; Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Education; Administrator Evaluation; Administrator Qualifications; Certification; *Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Instructional Leadership; Management Development; Occupational Information; Professional Development; School Administration; Standards
IDENTIFIERS	*Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium

ABSTRACT

Over the last 25 years, the field of school administration has experienced turmoil as it has struggled to grow out of its adolescence. A good deal of energy has been invested in coming to grips with the question of what ideas should shape school administration. This paper chronicles the role of one of the most significant reshaping initiatives to appear in the profession in recent times, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), and outlines the design of its change engine, the ISLLC Standards for School Leaders. Although there is, by necessity, a bit of history in the narrative, this paper is not a historical account. Rather it is an analysis of a concerted effort to rebuild the foundations of school administration, both within the practice and academic domains of the profession. After a brief note on the formation of ISLLC, the paper discusses two topics: (1) exposing the scaffolding that supports the standards; and (2) addressing critiques that have been directed at the standards and their use in the rebuilding process. The paper contains two tables titled "A Typical Masters of School Administration Program" and "The ISLLC Principles and Standards." (Contains 182 references.) (Author/WFA)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 481 619

Reculturing Educational Leadership:

The ISLLC Standards Ten Years Out

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Joseph Murphy

Vanderbilt University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Thomson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Paper prepared for the National Policy

Board for Educational Administration

September 2003

EA 032 823

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Over the last quarter century, the field of school administration has experienced considerable turmoil as it has struggled to grow out of its adolescence. During the last half of that time period, in ways that were rarely seen earlier in our profession, a good deal of energy has been invested in coming to grips with the question of what ideas should shape school administration in a post-theory era inside the academy and a post-industrial world for education writ large. This article chronicles the role of arguably the most significant reshaping initiative afoot in the profession during this time, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) and outlines the design of its change engine, the ISLLC Standards for School Leaders. Although there is, by necessity, a bit of history in the narrative, it is not an historical story. Rather it is an analysis of a concerted effort to rebuild the foundations of school administration, both within the practice and academic domains of the profession. After a brief note on the formation of ISLLC, the article attends to two assignments: exposing the scaffolding that supports the Standards and addressing critiques that have been directed at the Standards and their use in the rebuilding process.

A Note About ISLLC

In order to understand the work of ISLLC, it is necessary to first introduce the National Commission for Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEEA) and the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA). As we alluded to above, during the mid to late 1980s the seeds of critique that had been planted in reaction to post-WWII reforms in educational administration (see, for example, Culbertson, 1964; Erickson, 1977; Farquhar, 1968; Greenfield, 1975; Gregg, 1969; Harlow, 1962; Hills, 1975; Immegart, 1977) began to take root (Cooper & Boyd, 1987; Crowson & McPherson, 1987; Foster, 1984; Goldhammer, 1983; Griffiths, 1979, 1988) and long dormant censures of the profession's infatuation with all things corporate (see

especially Newlon, 1934; Callahan, 1962) were resurrected (Bates, 1984; Sergiovanni, 1984). Individual streams of criticism flowing from quite diverse sectors of the educational administration terrain formed a powerful river of discontent (see Murphy, 1990b; 1990c; 1990e; 1991a; 1992b for extended analysis of these dynamics as well as of change forces external to school administration in play at the end of the 1980s), one to which considerable new energy was added in the early 1990s (see especially a growing body of analysis from scholars employing more critical academic lenses such as Anderson, 1990; Donmoyer & Scheurich, 1994; Evans, 1991).

The profession as a whole, up to this time comfortably complacent ((McCarthy, Kuh, Newell, & Iacona, 1988; Murphy, 1991a), began to stir (Murphy, 1993a; Murphy & Forsyth, 1999). Under the leadership of then-UCEA Executive Director, Patrick Forsyth, and the leading academic figure in the field of school administration at the time, Daniel Griffiths, the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration was formed to galvanize collective action on the challenges, opportunities, and problems confronting the field of school leadership. (See Forsyth, 1999, for an historical treatment of NCEEA.) While the legacy of this important marker in our history is yet to be determined, outcomes of the efforts of the NCEEA are visible throughout the field today (Murphy, 1999a). One of the most important of these is the existence of the NPBEA, a loosely yoked association of ten stakeholder organizations with major interests in school administration, including, from the academic section of the profession, AACTE, NCATE, NCPEA, and UCEA. (See Thomson, 1999, for a history of the NPBEA and its work.)

The NPBEA, under the leadership of its then-Corporate Secretary, Scott Thomson, created ISLLC in 1994 to develop standards to anchor the profession as it headed into the 21st century. At its foundation, ISLLC was comprised of 24 states, most of the members of the

NPBEA, and other key stakeholder groups, such as the National Alliance of Business, with an interest in the health of leadership in America's schools and school districts. In order to better link the standards work to the policy machinery of licensure and accreditation, ISLLC was housed at CCSSO. This move made additional sense because the Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) which was working under the leadership of Linda Darling-Hammond to develop standards for teachers was already located at CCSSO.

During its formative period, ISLLC was shaped by Scott Thomson, Corporate Secretary for the NPBEA; Ramsey Seldon, who had oversight responsibility for the project at CCSSO; and Joseph Murphy, Chair of the Consortium. As grant resources to fuel the project began to flow and the workload began to expand, Neil Shipman was hired as the full-time Executive Director to shepherd operations and Raymond Pechone, then-Director of Assessment for the State of Connecticut, was recruited to advise on the methodological and statistical dimensions of the Consortium's work.

Reculturing the Profession

> Although numerous sources may be cultivated, norms rooted in the ethos and culture of teaching as a profession provide the most effective basis for leadership in a school. (Greenfield, 1995, p. 75)
>
> A new leadership model must construe school leadership as being about students, learning, and teaching. (Donaldson, 2001, p. 30)
>
> Insofar as there is any empirical evidence on the frequency of actual instructional leadership in the work of school administrators, it points to a consistent pattern: direct involvement in instruction is among the least frequent activities performed by administrators of any kind at any level, and those who do engage in instructional leadership activities on a consistent basis are a relatively small proportion of the total administrative force. (Elmore, 2000, p. 7)

The history of the early work of ISLLC and the remarkable leadership of a handful of dedicated state leaders is a fascinating narrative that has never been fully told, although it is partially explored elsewhere (Murphy & Shipman, 1999; 2002; 2003; Murphy, Yff & Shipman, 2000). It is also beyond the purview of our assignment here. Our goal is narrower, i.e., to explore how the Consortium labored to reshape school administration in the U.S. In order to undertake this assignment, it is important to examine the landscape the Consortium confronted in its quest to develop standards and to cobble together an array of strategies to use to bring those standards to life.

The Existing Landscape

The field of school administration was informed during its initial phase of development by ideas from philosophy and religion, which resulted in something akin to a doctrine of applied philosophy being introduced to the profession (Button, 1966; Callahan & Button, 1964; Moore, 1964). Unfortunately, few of the ideas embedded in the ideal of the administrator as philosopher-educator from the 1800s found their way into the blueprints of the profession (Callahan, 1962; Farquhar, 1968; Harlow, 1962). Instead, school administration was constructed almost entirely on a two-layered foundation built up during the 19th century: concepts from management, especially from the private sector, and theories and constructs borrowed from the behavioral sciences.

The idea of school leaders as business managers first surfaced during the early decades of the 20th century when the paramount hero in the larger society was corporate enterprise and its apotheosis, the CEO (Gregg, 1960; Newlon, 1934; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). This perspective has been reenergized and refined over the decades as each new idea from the corporate sector is held

up as a tool or framework that school administrators should adopt (e.g., management by objectives, total quality management, benchmarking, 360 degree evaluation, and so forth).

After WWII, the mosaic of American society and the issues confronting school leaders began to change (Hencley, 1962; Norton, 1957; Watson, 1977). Scientists, not businesspeople, were held in highest regard (Halpin, 1960) and a quest for a science of administration in schools was engaged (Culbertson, 1964, 1965; Greenfield, 1988). Forged from withering attacks on "the hortatory, seat-of-the pants literature already in place" (Crowson & McPherson, 1987, pp. 447-48) and a movement "away from techniques-oriented substance based on practical experience" (Culbertson & Farquhar, 1971, p. 9; Halpin, 1957) and crafted from clamorings for more scientifically based underpinnings for the profession (Getzels, 1957; Griffiths, 1959; Grace, 1946; Halpin, 1960), knowledge blocks from the behavioral and social sciences were laid into the foundation of school administration. While advocates of the behavioral sciences were somewhat successful in cementing a science of administration into the profession, historical reviews are much less sanguine about their efforts to dismantle the existing management pillars supporting school administration (Campbell, Fleming, Newell & Bennon, 1987; Murphy, 1992b). Instead, what developed was a ladder-shaped structure for the profession, with one leg fostering the growth of ideas from management and the other leg nurturing the development of concepts from the social sciences. Anyone who seeks confirmation of this reality need look no further than the traditional curriculum that defines graduate study in school administration (see Table 1)—courses, for the record, that "are not informed by a vision for leading change to meet students' needs" (Fay, 1991, p. 72).

--Insert Table 1 About Here—

This was the intellectual landscape confronting ISLLC when it began its work, i.e., fairly well established patterns but with significant discontent with those motifs, a fair amount of critique, and a few rudimentary change initiatives in play. A corollary was the reliance in the profession on a well-worn strategy for trying to garner improvements, that is, by adding lengths to either or both sides of the ladder. For example, if current management ideology is not performing to expectations, add new ideas from our corporate colleagues (e.g., transformational leadership or Baldridge models). Or, if knowledge from the currently highlighted portfolio of behavioral sciences is proving inadequate, stretch the ladder by adding new ones. Anyone who has a history in the profession will remember when first sociology (organizational theory), then political science (politics of education), and then anthropology (qualitative methods) were introduced as new paradigms to put the challenges confronting school administration to rest (Murphy, 1991a).

Alternative Pathways: The ISLLC Architecture

Based on extensive reviews of the literature in school administration, the ISLLC project decided early on that rebuilding school administration by polishing up or extending the current foundations, i.e., expanding the current ladder-shaped underpinning of the profession, would likely be less than fruitful. While cognizant that ideas from these two domains are of importance to school administrators, we concluded that they no longer merited their exclusive franchise (see also Sergiovanni, 1990). We decided, therefore, not to focus on the two questions that had guided the development of the field for the past century: (1) What is afoot in the corporate world that we can borrow to rethink the work of school leaders and (2) What is unfolding in the behavioral sciences that can be applied to power reform efforts? We sought alternative and what we hoped would be more productive pathways to our goal of regrounding the profession.

Because many colleagues had already exposed problems with the current state of the field (see for example Beck, 1994; Donmoyer & Scheurich, 1994; Greenfield, 1988; Griffiths, Forsyth, & Stout, 1988) [and for comprehensive historical treatments of problems see Newlon, 1934, Callahan, 1962, Campbell et al., 1987, and Murphy, 1992b], organizing the critical analysis was a less arduous aspect of the ISLLC work. Considerably more effort needed to be devoted to developing alternative blueprints that might be productive to follow in rebuilding school administration and in securing and arranging the raw material to be employed in the construction process. A portfolio of eight strategies was assembled, in addition to examining the status quo in the field at large and reviewing standard-like ideas already in play in the associations. Each of the pathways is noted below in the form of a question followed by brief review of the answer developed to shape the formulation of the standards and to help recenter school administration. We begin with two questions at the heart of the matter.

1. What do we know about schools where all youngsters achieve at high levels?

A significant chunk of the Standards is supported by the empirical findings from studies of effective schools and from the larger body of research on school improvement in which school effects studies are nested. The framework employed by ISLLC was developed by Murphy and Hallinger in the early 1980s (see Murphy, Hallinger, & Mesa, 1985; Murphy, Weil, Hallinger, & Mitman, 1985)[1] and by the time of the formation of the Consortium had been deepened by a decade of additional research (see Beck & Murphy, 1996; and Murphy, Beck, Crawford, Hodges, & McGaughy, 2001, and Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000, for post-standards development reviews).[2] The framework also included the research on teacher effects (see Brophy & Good, 1985; Murphy, Weil, & McCreal, 1986; Rosenshine, 1983). The definition of effective, or success, or improvement is the standard one forged by school effectiveness researchers in the early 1980s;

that is, (1) high levels of student achievement (quality dimension), (2) achievement results that are fairly distributed across the student population (equity dimension), and (3) outcomes that are attributable to the school (value added dimension) (Murphy, Hallinger, & Peterson, 1986).

The body of research on school improvement underscores a variety of conditions linked to the core technology that help explain student learning (e.g., opportunity to learn, direct instruction of basic skills, tightly aligned curriculum, careful and systematic monitoring of student performance) as well as a host of school-level cultural or environmental variables associated with achievement (e.g., a safe, orderly learning environment; academically focused rewards and incentives; a personalized learning environment in which children are well-known and cared for; a sense of community among staff; well developed and academically focused linkages between home and school). The collective body of research on school effects also features important perspectives and values largely absent from education for most of the 20th century: (1) the need to backward map administrative action from student outcomes; (2) the belief that all youngsters can learn; (3) the understanding that schools are responsible for student outcomes; and (4) the knowledge that schools work best when they operate as organic wholes rather than as collections of disparate systems and elements (see Murphy, 1992a; 1992c for earlier and Murphy & Datnow, 2003a; 2003b for post-standards development discussions of these four points).

Empirical evidence on the centrality of mission (vision) and community is also laced throughout the effective schools research. So too, the spotlight in this literature is clearly directed at youngsters who had been left behind in America's schools for nearly a century, especially children from low-income homes, students of color, and pupils with a first language

other than English (Edmonds, 1979; Ellis, 1975; Gault & Murphy, 1987; Murphy, 1995a; Weber, 1971).

While the early research on school effectiveness was flawed in important ways (Huberman, 1993; Murphy, Hallinger, & Mesa, 1985; Ralph & Fennessey, 1983; Rowan, Bossert, & Dwyer, 1983; Sirotnik, 1985),in its second generation package, it provided a robust collection of findings that could be used by ISLLC to help reshape understanding of the purposes of school administration and the appropriate functions of school leaders. The aim of the development team was then to define leadership in terms of connections to conditions of schooling (e.g., high and appropriate expectations, clear academic goals) that explain student achievement—to backward map leadership from student learning (see Evertson & Murphy, 1992; Murphy, 1991b; and Murphy, 1999c; 2004 for comprehensive post-standards development discussions).

2. What do we know about the actions and values of the women and men who lead effective schools and productive schools systems?

In developing the Standards, the Consortium also relied heavily on the research on principals and superintendents who were especially productive in leading high-performing organizations, again with performance being established by reference to the three-part definition of effectiveness outlined above (quality, equity, and value added). We employed "instructional leadership" frameworks developed by Murphy and Hallinger from their empirical studies and their reviews of existing research available at the time the Consortium began its work. (For principals see Beck & Murphy, 1992; 1993; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Louis & Murphy, 1994; Murphy & Hallinger, 1992; Murphy, Hallinger, Weil, Mitman, 1983a; and Murphy 1990d; 1994c; for superintendents see Hallinger & Murphy, 1982; Murphy, 1994a; 1995b; Murphy &

Hallinger, 1986; 1988; Murphy, Hallinger, Peterson, Lotto, 1987; and Peterson, Murphy, & Hallinger, 1987; and for critical analyses see Hallinger & Murphy, 1987; Murphy, Hallinger, Lotto, & Miller, 1987; Murphy, Hallinger, Weil, & Mitman, 1983b; and Murphy, 1988b).

At the risk of considerable oversimplification, the research revealed portraits of effective leaders who had a deeper understanding of and who were much more heavily invested in the core business of schooling—learning and teaching—than was the norm in the profession (McNeil, 1988). It surfaced a narrative of leaders who were concerned with nourishing the educational as well as the managerial arteries of influence. It provided a picture of school administrators who had a gift for "infus[ing] organizational routines with educational meaning (Rallis, 1989, p. 201). Thus answers to this question again led the Consortium to conclude that the organizing animus for school administration should be student learning and that the professional spotlight should shine on outcomes in this area. Or, as Evans (1991) so nicely captures it, "the deep significance of the task of school administration is to be found in the pedagogical ground of its vocation. It is the notion of education that gives the idea of leader its whole purpose" (pp. 17, 3).

In addition to examining empirical findings on productive schools and their leaders, the Consortium also explored how the educational industry itself was changing and what those changes might suggest for leadership in a post-industrial environment. Questions 3 and 4 directed team members' inquiry in this area.

3. <u>What trends are visible in the environment in which schooling is embedded that are likely to reshape the educational enterprise?</u>

Having repositioned learning on center stage of the school administration play, the Consortium looked outward. The starting point here was the understanding that almost all of the major forces that have shaped schooling in significant ways have come from outside education.

That is, changes are traceable to larger shifts in the economic, political, and social environments in which education is nested (Murphy, 1991b, 1992b and for post-standards development work on this topic Murphy, 2000, and Murphy, Beck, Knapp, & Portin, 2003). The Consortium believed that powerful forces underway in these three domains were in the process of reshaping the contours of schooling and would, in turn, exert considerable influence on the types of leadership required to lead these organizations.

On the social front, ISLLC members identified two major trends: a reweaving of the societal tapestry (e.g., changing family complexion, increased immigration, shifting social patterns) and an unraveling of the fabric for many youngsters and their families (e.g., increasing poverty, declining indices of physical well-being for youngsters) (Wagstaff & Gallagher, 1990). On the political front, the Consortium discerned a decline in the prominence of the democratic welfare state that defined America for most of the 20th century. They saw an increase in the use of markets to achieve public objectives and a crumbling of the firewall that stood between the government and market spheres of activity (Murphy, 1992b, 1996; for post-standards development work, see Murphy, 1999b, Murphy, Gilmer, Weise, & Page, 1998). Finally, on the economic horizons, they perceived a post-industrial world in which globalism, competition, and market forces would be more pronounced (Marshall & Tucker, 1992; Murname & Levy, 1996) and would continue to exert even greater influence over schooling (e.g., standards, accountability, choice).

4. What are the major changes underway in the schooling enterprise itself?

The development of the Standards was also influenced by analysis of key changes unfolding in each of the three levels of the school organization, often as a consequence of the external forces noted above: in the core technology, in the procedures and arrangements by

which schools are organized and managed, and in the ways schools work with their constituents (Murphy, 1991b; Murphy & Hallinger, 1993; for a post-Standards discussion of changes in these three areas see chapters 8-19 in the Handbook of Research on Educational Administration [Murphy & Louis, 1999]). In the area of learning and teaching, from the cognitive sciences ISLLC participants saw the emergence of a new theory of learning, a regrounding of education around principles of learning (rather than around teaching strategies), and an explicit acknowledgment of the cultural and social dimensions of learning. The Consortium also perceived a deepening of instructional perspectives (and accompanying views of assessment) beyond the transmission and delivery models of teaching that had proven their worth in helping youngsters master basic skills. They foresaw a more pronounced place in the pedagogical portfolio for constructively grounded perspectives (e.g., scaffolded instruction, cognitively guided instruction) (Bransford, 1991; Cohen, 1989; for reviews employed by the Consortium, see Evertson & Murphy, 1992; Hallinger, Leithwood, & Murphy, 1993; Murphy, 1991; 1992b; for an especially illuminating recent review of research in this area see the National Research Council report on learning by Bransford, Brown, and Cocking, 2000).

In the organization and management domain, ISLLC team members observed trend lines moving away from the heavy reliance on hierarchical forms and bureaucratic tenets that characterized schools in the 20th century (Sykes & Elmore, 1989; Weick & McDaniel, 1989). They saw instructional values vis-à-vis managerial values "gain[ing] a new currency" (Johnson, 1989, p. 110). They saw organization being informed by and in the service of learning (Little, 1987)--of organization growing from our best theories of learning (Elmore, 1990; 1991; 1996; Evertson & Murphy, 1992; Marshall, 1990). They discerned a re-coupling of administration and teaching (Evertson & Murphy, 1992). They discussed an evolution to smaller, flatter,

knowledge-shaped, and market-influenced organizational forms (e.g., small schools, charter schools, networks of home-schooled youngsters) as well as a wider distribution of influence, judgment, and leadership; (e.g., teacher leadership, site-based management) (Murphy, 1994b; Murphy & Beck, 1995). The central shift underway was from a focus on schools as organizations to schools as communities---to "the metaphor of the school as community" (Little & McLaughlin, 1993a, p. 189) (see especially Beck, 1994; Sergiovanni, 1984; 1994). The notion of community that found its way into the Standards was comprised of three key ideas, building powerful connections: (1) between home and school (home-school community); (2) among adults in the school (community of practice, "ethic of collaboration" [Lieberman & Miller, 1999, p. 64], and "community of leadership" [Barth, 1988, p. 129]); and (3) between adults and youngsters (a personalized learning climate [Sizer, 1984]) (for a review, see Beck & Murphy, 1996).

On relations with environmental actors, Consortium members judged that in the educational system of the future considerably more influence would be exerted by parents, by direct governance (e.g., charter schools) or through market mechanisms (e.g., various forms of choice) (see Murphy, 1996 for a review of the material employed by the Consortium during the Standards development process and 1999b; 2000; and Murphy and Shiffman, 2002 for updated analyses). They also foresaw an enhanced role for other environmental actors from the government and business community (Murphy, 1990a).

Building from the raw material garnered from the four earlier inquiries,[3] the Consortium also asked two questions that helped deepen the research-anchored, value threads that became woven into the Standards. One question raised the assignment of teasing out the valued

outcomes of schooling while the second directed the Consortium to a consideration of the valued outcomes of preparation programs in school administration.

5. What are the valued ends of schooling?

Consistent with the logic employed throughout the development process, ISLLC team members believed that blueprints for school leadership would be stronger and more elegant if the focus was less on the dynamics of administration and more on what was best for youngsters in schools. In order to continue their operationalization of this guiding principle, attention was directed to the preferred ends of schooling, of which three stood out for team members: school improvement, community, and social justice (Beck & Murphy, 1993; 1994; Murphy, 1992b; also see Murphy, 2002a and 2002b for post-standards development analyses of this framework). Since the former two ends have already received significant attention above, the focus here is on the concept of social justice. As Riehl (2000) has noted, when we turn to schooling social justice decomposes into two large and interconnected strands of ideas. One dimension is directed toward the role of the school in creating a more just society. The other attends to the just treatment of youngsters, and adults, inside the "school community." It was scholarship in this latter area that most heavily influenced the work of the Consortium (Bates, 1994; Starratt, 1991; for scholarship employed by the Consortium, see reviews by Beck, 1994; Beck & Murphy, 1994; Beck, Murphy, & Associates, 1997; for a more recent comprehensive examination of this topic in school administration see Capper & Young, forthcoming; Larson & Murtadha, 2002; Riehl, 2000; and Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2001).

Consistent with the earlier analysis, the three dimensional social justice spotlight of care, critique, and justice was pointed directly at the equitable or inequitable provision of access to conditions of classrooms and schools that explain student learning (time, quality instruction,

personalization, content coverage, academic press, and so forth) (for reviews used by the Consortium, see Murphy, 1988a; 1993b; Murphy, Hallinger, & Lotto, 1986), what Murphy and Hallinger (1989) refer to as "equity as access to learning." Another element of this work focused on the reality that inequities in access to powerful conditions of learning, and often the resources that ensure their availability, fall disproportionately on children of color and youngsters from low-income homes, as the following quote from one of the early effective schools studies illustrates:

> Go into a city, find where the poor people live, visit one of the elementary schools their children attend, and the overwhelming likelihood is that you will be in a school that is failing to teach its students to read. (Ellis, 1975, p. 4)

Throughout most of the 20th century, schools educated well about one-third of their young charges. Another 40 percent were schooled but hardly well educated. And about a quarter of the children were left behind all together (Powell, Farrar, & Cohen, 1985; Sedlak, Wheeler, Pullin, & Cusick, 1986; Murphy, et al., 2001). Poor minority children were disproportionately clustered in these latter two groups. The great tragedy here is that the profession's 100-year infatuation with management practices and chunks of knowledge from the behavioral sciences rarely pushed the field of school administration to acknowledge let alone address this reality. The Consortium found this unacceptable. In reaching that conclusion, they developed a platform that demands, as one critic of the Standards laments, "school leaders [who] wield political and legal levers to advance social justice" (Hess, 2003, p. 14).

6. What are the valued goals of educational programs in school administration?

Because in many ways school administration as an applied field is defined by its preparatory structure in the US, ISLLC team members asked themselves, in light of everything

else they were learning, in broad strokes what should be the aims of preparation programs. Relying on analyses of the historical development of these programs as well as the critical reviews of their strengths and weaknesses available at the time (Campbell, et al., 1987; Donmoyer & Scheurich, 1994; Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth, 1988; Murphy, 1990e; Silver, 1982; Silver & Spuck, 1978), the Consortium identified four key outcomes they valued for graduates of educational administration programs. Or stated alternatively, they focused on four broad program objectives: (1) facilitating the development of inquiry skills, or enhancing the thinking abilities of students; (2) helping students develop a robust understanding of education—of learning, teaching, and school improvement; (3) promoting development of broad-based knowledge of people (as individuals, as members of groups, as parts of organizations, and as members of society) and the skills required to work productively with others; and (4) assisting students in developing an explicit set of values and beliefs (e.g., student learning is the fundamental purpose of schooling, diversity enriches the school) to shape their actions in leading schools where all students succeed at high levels (see Murphy, 1992b for an extended treatment of the framework employed by ISLLC).

Concurrent with engaging the inquiry process outlined above, ISLLC team members kept one eye focused on understanding the needs of customers and one directed toward discerning the expectations of resource providers, thus the final two questions.

7. What are the needs and wants of the customers of school administration preparation programs?

Three groups were highlighted here: students of preparation programs, employing organizations, and professional associations. On the first issue, the Consortium turned to critiques of educational leadership programs cited earlier, many of which were animated by

voices from the practice arm of the field, i.e., former students. On the second area, the Consortium had members of the team collect input and gather feedback on the draft Standards from practicing principals and superintendents throughout the country. At the central level, the Consortium relied upon input from a team of highly effective principals to inform the development process. In assessing the needs of the practice-based professional associations, developers depended on the perspectives provided by representatives of those associations who were represented on the Consortium.

8. What are the expectations of resource providers?

Three sub groups were in play here also: citizens, government oversight agencies, and host universities. In reviewing the expectations of the general population (i.e., citizens and taxpayers), by necessity more attention was devoted to education writ large than to school administration in particular. The research of the Public Agenda group was especially informative. Since the Consortium was populated primarily by colleagues from the various oversight agencies and had a fair representation of university faculty, we depended heavily upon them—including collecting feedback from their constituents--to help answer the inquiry about the expectations of resource providers.

The ISLLC Platform: "Standards for School Leaders"

In answering these eight questions, ISLLC produced a foundation for the profession that is quite distinct from the ladder structure described earlier. That platform is comprised of the set of core principles and Standards found in Table 2.

--Insert Table 2 About Here—

The consortium maintains that the Standards for School Leaders—and the intellectual pillars on which they rest—provide the means to shift the metric of school administration from

management to educational leadership and from administration to learning while linking management and behavioral science knowledge to the larger goal of student learning. In so doing, the ISLLC work corrects perhaps the most significant deficiency in the development of school administration—when we became "conceived as a special field within the larger field of Administration rather than as a special field with the larger field of Education" (Boyan, 1963, p. 12; see also Newlon, 1934; Callahan, 1962; Evans, 1991).

The ISLLC Change Design and Action to Date

As noted earlier, the Consortium's objective was not simply to establish an alternative vision for the field based on deep historical analysis, the best available research, and sound professional judgment but to redirect movement within the field consistent with that vision. We were concerned as much about implementation as we were about development (see Bogotch, 2002). ISLLC has consciously sought to create action vehicles and to define productive paths of travel. It also has worked to provision colleagues for the voyage and to provide supports and eliminate barriers along the way, although, as discussed below, not everyone interprets the story the way ISLLC does or considers all the work to be "helpful."

While it is not our intention to catalogue ISLLC activity to date here, it is instructive to briefly expose the strategy framework employed by the Consortium and to illustrate how it is using state policy in particular to help rebuild school administration throughout the US. This brief synopsis will prove helpful when we turn to examining critique of ISLLC and its work in the final section. The strategy is to engage with the full array of partners (e.g., states, professional associations, universities, private firms, and so on) across an assortment of "leverage" areas (e.g., licensure, professional development, program accreditation, and so forth) employing three key change strategies (i.e., lateral, top down, bottom up). A few examples of

work focused on policy are presented below. Please note, however, that in so doing we ignore ISLLC's use of professional (associations and universities) and market-based strategies to reshape school administration as well as its use of lateral and bottom up change strategies, as well as an assortment of combinations.

Standards adoption. In addition to being adopted by members of the NPBEA, the ISLLC Standards have been codified in approximately 40 states as the platform for thinking about school administration.

Program redesign. A good number of the 40 states noted above require universities to align their preparation programs with the Standards.

Program approval. An assortment of states that rely on state agencies to conduct reviews of preparation programs have changed regulations to align these assessments with the Standards.

Program accreditation. The most effective collaborative activity at the national level between the academic and practice arms of the profession in the last quarter century recently resulted in NCATE adopting the ISLLC Standards for the accreditation of preparation programs in school administration. Because NCATE has policy-anchored connections with more than 45 states, all programs in NCATE institutions fall under the professional and state-policy umbrella of the Standards.

Licensure. Nearly all the states that have adopted the Standards have rewritten licensure regulations to spotlight this new stage for action. In addition, ISLLC contracted with ETS to develop an exit examination for prospective principals scaffolded on the Standards (see Latham & Pearlman, 1999; Tannenbaum, 1999). To date, 13 states require passage of this examination ("School Leaders Licensure Assessment") for initial licensure and another seven or so are

working their way toward adoption. A related examination to be employed with prospective superintendents was recently created and is required in two states currently.

Relicensure. In order to make the transition from an initial to a continuing license, four states require completion of the ISLLC beginning administration assessment—a two-year, portfolio-based development program constructed around four problems of practice specifically developed for new school leaders. In addition, in a number of other states (e.g., Delaware, New Jersey) relicensure connected to earning continuing education credits is explicitly linked in code to the Standards.

Professional development. In addition to a significant expansion of professional development enterprises at the association, district, and university levels, a growing number of state-based leadership academies are surfacing. A few states (e.g., New Jersey, Ohio) explicitly link development center activities to the Standards.

Administrator evaluation. Schools throughout the nation are linking the Standards via district policy to reform the evaluation of school leaders. At the state policy level, action is afoot in a number of states, most productively in Delaware where a statewide model of evaluation based on the Standards has been enacted.

Whole state reform. In its formative period, ISLLC partnered with two states (Mississippi and North Carolina) that crafted comprehensive, policy-based reform plans to recenter school administration around learner-centered leadership. These frameworks, in turn, provided the central elements in the Wallace-Readers Digest State Action for Educational Leadership Project (SAELP) in 15 additional states—an initiative that promotes recasting school administration via state policy.

Examining the Critique of ISLLC and Its Work

> [The Standards] endorse a doctrinaire philosophy of educational leadership motivated by a particular vision of "social justice" and "democratic community" and dismissive of conventional management theory. (Hess, 2003, p. 13, emphasis added)

> The standards have emerged from a complex mixture of ideological sources, but perhaps the most influential is the business-oriented influence of the administrative progressives that have shaped the field over the past 100 years. (Anderson, 2001, p. 202)

Mark these two critiques of the Standards. We return to them throughout this section.

In this final section of the chapter, we explore issues raised by colleagues who have provided critical reviews of the Standards themselves and the ISLLC strategy of employing the Standards to recenter the profession. A few points are raised to get us started. First, since as Ayn Rand from the right and Paul Goodman from the left have astutely observed, no one ever wins an argument, we will endeavor to avoid that path in this discussion. Rather, and consistent with the descriptions provided above, we will focus on providing explanations for the decisions that the Consortium made in the hope that such information will be helpful to colleagues thinking through points of contention. In the words of Anderson (2001), we present our "position on the issues" (p. 205) inside the Standards. Second, our focus is on critical reviews. We avoid the temptation to catalogue favorable responses. Nor do we examine the body of literature that explores the use of the Standards throughout the nation. Third, and not surprisingly given the responsibility of university faculty to provide critical perspectives, our comments are directed almost exclusively to products of colleagues in the academy. Indeed, colleagues from the practice and policy domains of the profession have provided almost no written criticism of the Standards or their deployment. Fourth, we attempt to stay locked on the

ISLLC Standards and school administration as much as possible. That is, many of the issues raised in regards to the ISLLC Standards and their use have been surfaced by analysts in reference to the INTASC Standards for teachers. In addition, there is a growing body of critical analysis on most of the issues embedded in the ISLLC narrative (e.g., standards-based reform, licensure, accreditation) quite independent of any reference to school administration and ISLLC. Most of this later corpus of information is to be found in and around the school reform literature. Here we are interested in these topics only in the context of school administration and the ISLLC Standards.

Finally, as the two quotes that opened this section make transparent, where one is positioned on the intellectual and reform landscape and the perspectives one employs have a good deal to say about the nature of the critique provided. Three examples illustrate this point nicely. First, reviewers coruscating over the Standards from one vantage point discern an attempt by the government-professional cartel (i.e., the iron triangle of state government, universities, and professional associations) that currently has control of the profession to solidify its dominance, an attempt to reinforce producer control over the profession (Hess, 2003). Other writers examining the same phenomena, spy one sector of the cartel (i.e., state agencies) fighting to augment their power at the expense of the other cartel players (i.e., universities), a type of recalibration of the control dynamics inside the family if you will (Foster, 2002; Marshall & McCarthy, 2002). Still others view the process of standards deployment and implementation as a blatant effort to wrest control of the profession away from historically privileged members of the cartel, especially as a type of frontal assault on the long-ingrained control by universities (English, 2003).

Turning to a second example, critics inspecting the Standards from one intellectual vantage point chastise the Consortium for what they discern as evidence of "industrial psychology" in the architecture of the Standards (Anderson et al., 2002). At the same time, different analysts denounce the Standards for their "endorsement" of constructivist psychology and pedagogy (Hess, 2003).

A third example illustrates our hypothesis on perspective—or the phenomenon known as "believing is seeing" (Lotto, 1983). One set of critics lambasts developers for "ISLLC's belief [that] school leaders ought to wield political and legal levers to advance social justice" (Hess, 2003, p. 14) and for the heavy emphasis on "diversity" (Hess, 2003, p. 14) in the Standards. Other critics lament what they perceive as insufficient attention to these two worthwhile ideas (Anderson, 2001; Marshall & McCarthy, 2002; Young & Liable, 2000).

A key point to these and related examples is that all the reviewers cannot be correct. The Standards cannot be both dismissive of management and privilege it at the same time. Neither can they both strengthen the iron hand of the government-university cartel over the education of school leaders and consciously undermine its power. Nor can they be so prescriptive as to be reductionist and so loose as to provide no prescriptions. To engage our charge, we cluster the major critiques into six comprehensive themes or issues for analysis.

Issue #1: The Standards Lack an Empirical Base.

Critics from various points on the political continuum have assailed ISLLC for what they contend is a lack of a research base undergirding the Standards. Hess (2003) in his policy brief on licensure asserts that the Standards "are rooted in no systematic evidence" (p. 23, note 62). English (2000, 2003) in an assortment of venues makes a similar claim. As a way of addressing this point, we direct the reader to the earlier section of the paper on "Alternative Pathways,"

especially to questions one and two, where we explain that the Standards rest heavily on the research on productive schools and districts and on investigations of the women and men who lead schools where all children are well educated—with, given the foundation of this research, a bias toward schools that work well for students of color and youngsters from low-income homes. At the same time, as we have already noted and expand on below, the "base" for the Standards includes a good deal of craft knowledge, or "the wisdom of practice" (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000, p. 4; see Shulman, 1987) from colleagues in the practice of school administration as well as a healthy amount of attention to important values that the Consortium agreed should shape the profession and the work of its members.

In retrospect, it is clear that the Consortium was remiss in not disseminating information on the empirical knowledge base upon which the Standards were scaffolded, or in the words of Leithwood and Steinbach (in press) in "not systematically describ[ing] the evidence on which the [the Standards] are based." We hope that the earlier analysis helps to address this need.

Issue #2: The Standards Are Based Too Heavily on Non-Empirical Ideals.

A corollary to the lack of empirical evidence critique is the judgment that the Standards are too loose; that they (1)"represent vague ideas rather than prescriptions for practice" (Hess, 2003, p. 23, note 62), that "ISLLC shrouds banalities and ideology in the guise of standards" p. 7); (2) attend to non-empirical beliefs and in so doing take on the trappings of religion (English, 2000); and (3) require faith on the part of readers (Leithwood & Steinbach, in press). While no one on the ISLLC team set out to create a religion, we certainly did attempt to privilege "ideals" and "non-empirical beliefs" (e.g., that leadership should be transparent and privilege collaboration, that diversity enriches the school) in the Standards, as well as empirical evidence.

While we say more about this below under the discussion of "dispositions," an example of the Consortium's thinking here might be helpful. Before the school effects research on which these Standards are based, one could count on one or two hands the school districts in the United States that disaggregated student achievement data by race, ethnicity, income status, gender, or any other category. As we noted above, research on especially productive schools and districts and leaders not only brought us important empirical evidence to shape leadership (e.g., the significance of systematic monitoring of student learning) but also a central set of values (e.g., the belief that all children can learn, the commitment to organize schooling to make that outcome occur, the belief that schools should be responsible for student performance) that in many respects are more important than the specific research findings (Murphy, 1992c). There is no empirical evidence that tells educators that they should improve the education of children by better serving students at risk. There are a number of ways to improve achievement that would not pursue this path (e.g., concentrating resources on youngsters below but near the success bar). The point is that this is a non-empirical conclusion, a value about what is important. Disaggregation's roots, and its consequent products, are in the seedbed of justice as much as they are in the soil of empirical evidence.

For better or worse, depending on where one falls in the debate, the ISLLC team held that a standards framework that helped inform the meaning of school leadership would be insufficient absent these and related values. Thus, the Consortium consciously acknowledges the importance of non-empirical material. At their core, the Standards are empirically anchored and values grounded. Or, in the words of Gronn (2002), they highlight the domains of "morality and epistemology" (p. 555)—they address "values dispositions and depth of expertise" (Little & McLaughlin, 1993, p. 6).

Issue #3: The Standards Do Not Cover Everything; Or They Do Not Include "X" Concept Or Examine "Y" Concept Deeply Enough.

On the first issue—comprehensiveness (see Keeler, 2002)—we can only report that that was the intention of the Consortium. The design never called for mapping all the dimensions of educational leadership and every indicator of practice in every context. The explicit goal, based on the empirical evidence discussed earlier, was to underscore learning and teaching. Maps of the full professional landscape can be found elsewhere—in the domain analysis provided by the NPBEA and in job analyses undertaken by the professional associations over the years and by Educational Testing Service in junction with the new school leader assessment. Our intention was to illuminate the knowledge that should occupy center stage in school administration and to show how other aspects of the profession can promote more effective student learning and more productive schools.

In terms of missing or underemphasized material, the response to date has been somewhat surprising. With the exception of Hess (2003), there has been almost no pushback from those who are being impacted by recalibrating the field around learning, especially from colleagues in areas such as school finance, school facilities, and so forth that have traditionally held some of the high ground in the profession. And while Hess (2003) oversells his critique (a surprisingly uniform feature of almost all of the critical literature reviewed) of ISLLC's "dismissive stance toward conventional management theory" (p. 13) he is essentially correct in his assessment of the Consortium's intent—as opposed to reviewers from the left who believe our goal was to spotlight "old assumptions of a conservative field that has historically been heavily influenced by business" (Anderson et al., 2002, p. 2). As we discussed in detail earlier, the clear intention of ISLLC, and we would argue the outcome of its work, was to replace the

heavy emphasis on management with empirical evidence and values from productive schools and to link everything else instrumentally to student learning.

The most consistent complaint about missing content over the last decade is directed at the absence of a separate standard on technology—a criticism emerging almost entirely from the practice arm of the profession. Indeed, when states adapt the Standards rather than adopting them outright, technology is the area that is most frequently added.

From the academic community, Anderson and his colleagues (2000), Furman and English (2000), Marshall and McCarthy (2002), and Young & Liable (2000) have surfaced concerns about whether two of the three concepts that support the Standards, i.e., community and social justice, are treated in sufficient depth and/or with the correct pitch. Holding aside for the moment the fact that "community" is the concept with the most play in the Standards—being mentioned roughly four times as often as all of the traditional management concepts collectively, the critics raise important points about the work of ISLLC that reveal differences of intention. For example, Furman sees the fact that "community is co-opted to serve. . . the instrumental purpose of increasing student achievement" (Anderson et al., 2002, p. 2) as problematic. She also believes that the construct of learning community ribboned throughout the Standards, one in which the concept is "limited to student performance" (p. 2), is flawed. While I share the concerns of many that achievement can be narrowly defined in ways that do more harm than good (Darling-Hammond, 1988; Huberman, 1993), to set community up independent of measures of student learning—and the metrics that assess such learning—seemed to the Consortium not to be an especially good idea. In short, we plead guilty to the charge, given robust rather than anemic measures of achievement. In the ISLLC framework, community is clearly conceptualized instrumentally in the service of student learning. Little (1987) captured

this point nicely when she noted that "the relations that teachers establish with fellow teachers or with other adults will—and must—be judged by their ability to make teachers' relations with students more productive" (p. 493). So too have Lieberman and Miller (1999):

> Schools can organize in many different ways, improve the professional lives of teachers and expand their roles, challenge regulations, and remove boundaries, but if student learning and engagement are not the focus they will accomplish little of value for students. School change and improvement must focus on students. This is not simply a gimmick that will lead to an understanding of what the school stands for. This is what helps shape the values and beliefs of a school community. In fact, it is what builds commitment to a real learning community. (p. 84)

At the same time, in her analysis, Professor Furman does uncover a gap in the definition of community laced through the Standards. As we outlined in an earlier section, the ISLLC concept of community decomposes into three ideas: a personalized learning environment for students (building powerful bonds between adults and youngsters), communities of practice and leadership for teachers, and school-home community. What Furman helps us see is that this framework fails to address communities of students sufficiently. Based on this analysis, and on appeal to scholarship in this area by Webb, Corbett, & Wilson (1993) and Osterman (2000), we believe that Bell Hooks' concept of "homeplace" might provide a good fourth dimension to the initial conceptualization of community integrated across the Standards.

Issue #4: The Standards Are Over (Or Under) Specified.

Some analysts find that the Standards are not sufficiently specified. The three critical points here have been laid out by Leithwood and Steinbach (in press). The first criticism relates to an issue previously examined, the assessment that the Standards do not cover everything, what the authors refer to as "errors of omission." Leithwood and Steinbach (in press) focus especially on missing practices needed by leaders in accountable contexts (see also Elmore, 2003). Second,

they lament that the Standards do not sufficiently address the contexts in which school leaders toil (see also Dantley & Cambron-McCabe, 2001, cited in Marshall & McCarthy, 2002). Finally, they find it troubling that the Standards fail to specify the criteria required to meet, or to be successful on, any given practice. Hess (2003) makes the same claim, asserting that the Standards are vague and lack specificity.

Others inspecting the same material reach quite different conclusions. They maintain that the ISLLC framework is so specific that it promotes reductionism and standardization in the profession writ large and in preparation programs in particular (English in Creighton & Young, 2003; Furman & English, 2002).

While, as noted earlier, the intent of the ISLLC project was to move our best understanding of learning to the heart of school administration, the Standards were left deliberately broad to allow concepts to evolve as research evidence accumulated. For example, from our answers to questions one and two above, we know that the principal's ability to support the professional and personal learning of teachers is related to student learning. Yet the knowledge base about the principles, elements, and qualities of productive professional development has grown significantly over the last decade (see, for example, Desimone, Porter, Garet, Yoon, & Birman, 2000; Sparks & Hirshman, 1997; Stigler & Hiebert, 1999; and Murphy, 2004 for a review). The terrain today is more developed and clearer than it was around 1995. So too are the indicators one might look for as evidence of leadership in this area. Since, as Shulman (1987) reminds us, knowledge is neither fixed nor final, the Standards were designed to accommodate such growth. The language was also kept broad to allow colleagues to arrive at the goals embedded in the Standards by varied paths and by multiple modes of travel.

From our vantage point, it is difficult to see how at the level of the "principles" (e.g., access, opportunity, and empowerment for all members of the school community) or the "standards" (e.g., a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner) the profession is in any danger of standardization because of ISLLC, especially in light of the remarkable uniformity already in play in preparation programs throughout the U.S. (Gronn, 2002). Rather, at this level, the critique of underspecification is more accurate, a censure to which we are honored to acquiesce.

The rub, as they say, for some is in the specificity provided by the nearly 200 "indicators," although as Keeler (2002) and Leithwood and Steinbach (in press) correctly note this is hardly a comprehensive list of all possible practices, chunks of information, and beliefs. What seems to be poorly understood here, a fault that rests at our feet to be sure, is that these indicators are examples of important knowledge, practices, and beliefs, not a full map. No effort was made to include everything or to deal with performances in the myriad of leadership contexts. Leadership is a complex and context-dependent activity. To attempt to envelope the concept with a definitive list of indicators is a fool's errand. Likewise, to claim success in a preparation program because there is evidence of the 200 indicators is also questionable. What we have provided are clues offered up by scholars from the academy, practitioners of the art of leadership (school principals from highly effective schools), and researchers studying schools that work especially well to help us see what each of the standards looks like, to provide some grist to those who need to undertake the hard work of bringing the Standards to life using the various leverage points discussed earlier (e.g., licensure). As Gronn (2002) correctly observes, we "opted for parsimony" (p. 563) in developing the ISLLC framework.

All of this returns us to the underspecification assertion. It turns out that the critics from this camp hold the high ground. For better or worse, the Standards were consciously designed to direct not determine action. The underspecification is not an accident, it is deliberate. The critical ingredients of context and specificity (see Hallinger & Murphy, 1996, 1997 for reviews on this issue)—what Weiler (1992) calls "the messy pragmatics and contingencies of educational practice" (p.101)--come into the picture when the Standards and the leverage points converge—keeping in mind at the same time an essential point of the Standards; that is, that the nature of leadership itself does not vary by social situation (Foster, 1986, p. 177). Examples in the areas of "professional development" and "principal evaluation" will help illustrate the intent of the Standards blueprint. At the Ohio Principals Leadership Academy, we developed a portfolio of programs for school principals. While all learning opportunities grew from the seedbed of the Standards and their underlying principles, performance indicators were tailored to different contexts. Our program for beginning school leaders was distinct from the one provided to career principals. In a similar vein, educational opportunities provided to high school principals in some cases employed different performances (and indicators) than the ones emphasized in programs for elementary school principals.

A similar theme is evident in the Delaware system for evaluating school leaders. The architecture for the assessment system, and each of its core components, is the same for all school leaders in the state. But the specific performances and criteria for success, both of which must be clearly outlined, materialize only in context. While all school leaders in Delaware are expected to nurture and support the development of a personalized learning community for youngsters, the specific aims to pursue, the means to reach these objectives, as well as the metrics and criteria to assess satisfactory progress are determined one school and one leader at a

time, depending on an array of contextual matters. Likewise, every principal is evaluated on her or his school's ability to promote high levels of student learning equitably distributed. The "standards" used to gain purchase on the goal as well as the "success criteria" are established one school at a time, with the likelihood that the bar for success would be set in different place for a principal assuming leadership of a designated "failing school" and for a principal with longer tenure in a more established school.

Issue #5. There Is No Legitimate Place for Dispositions in the Standards.

For a number of colleagues, the inclusion of dispositions in the framework is bothersome if not downright troubling. These critics see no place for beliefs and values in a standards framework. For some, incorporating values shifts the Standards away from a firm research base and toward "value expressions of faith" (English, 2001, p. 3). For others, standards that give space to dispositions place ISLLC "on thin conceptual and legal ice" (Leithwood & Steinbach, in press). For still others, the problem is more specific; they lament the particular focus of the dispositions, or what they call "disposition correction" (Hess, 2003, p. 14) to establish a doctrinaire philosophy of educational leadership motivated by a particular vision of 'social justice' and 'democratic community'" (p. 113).

Again, not for the sake of debate but to lay out the ISLLC position clearly, here is the background. Given the moral obliqueness that has characterized educational leadership for much of its history (Farquhar, 1981; Greenfield, 1975, 1988), the Consortium decided that it was not only appropriate but essential to incorporate values and beliefs in the Standards. We employed the term "dispositions" because it was already in use in the larger educational profession through the work of INTASC in developing standards for teachers.

The logic here was quite straightforward. First, much of what leaders do (e.g., respond to patterns of student failure) or do not do (e.g., ignore or justify failure) is shaped by their values and beliefs. Educational administration is fundamentally a moral activity (Culbertson, 1963; Harlow, 1960; Foster, 1984; 1986; Greenfield, 1995) that "requires a distinctive value framework" (Graff & Street, 1957, p. 120). The Consortium held that it was important to acknowledge and address this reality. It is also important, the ISLLC team argued, to recognize that these beliefs can have significant effects on the lives of youngsters, and their teachers and parents. For example, not empirical evidence but beliefs that special needs pupils, immigrants, children of color, and youngsters from low-income homes cannot be expected to be successful has had a major influence on schooling in the U.S. over the last 100 years. Where all youngsters do master important academic content, different belief structures are operational (Murphy, 2004). Values and beliefs influence policies, practices, and behaviors. We build a vision of school administration—and standards that define that vision—without attending to them at our peril, as scholars over the last 50 years have shown (Callahan, 1962; Greenfield, 1988). Second, the Consortium held that the fight to create a scientifically anchored, value-free profession had brought forth an ethically truncated if not morally bankrupt profession (see Beck & Murphy, 1994, 1997 for reviews). To be sure, there was danger in emphasizing beliefs and values in the Standards. But from where we stood, the greater danger was in ignoring them.

Once we entered this door, we were confronted by the thorny issue of measurement. Nonetheless, our stance on this was and continues to be clear. To ignore topics that we hold to be important for the profession either because they cannot be directly linked to empirical evidence or cannot be easily measured is the hallmark of foolishness. When values cannot be assessed, or in forums where it is inappropriate to attempt such work (e.g., licensure

examinations), they are not measured. Where we can garner some traction on the assessment issue (e.g., the hiring process), the Consortium suggests that the profession should try to do so. For example, contrary to what some critics suggest (Hess, 2003), the ISLLC-ETS licensure assessment does not attempt to measure dispositions. The focus is solely on the knowledge and performance indicators. To do otherwise would be highly questionable and legally indefensible. And in the portfolio of criticisms of ETS and the SLLA test (see Anderson, 2001), legal naiveté is conspicuous by its absence.

At the same time, for university preparation programs, school districts, professional development centers, and others to ignore core values because they are difficult to capture makes little sense, at least to the ISLLC participants. For example, we know from a series of especially high quality studies that "even at 'the starting gate'—when all children enroll in school for the first time—certain children (particularly those who are Black, Hispanic, or lower SES) enter school both cognitively and socially disadvantaged" (Lee & Burkham, 2002, p. 22; also Hart & Risley, 1995; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998). We are also aware that schools are often organized and programs often delivered in ways to exacerbate these initial disadvantages (see Murphy & Hallinger, 1989, for a review). Yet, while the information to address these challenges can often be found in the research literature, the starting point is the disposition to address the problem, an issue of values first and foremost, whether in the hearts of individuals or, increasingly, captured in policy (Edmonds, 1979). Identifying and nurturing leaders who have such a disposition seems like a good idea to the Consortium. Consequently, such values need to inform the Standards that define the profession.

Issue #6. The Standards Are Exerting Undue Influence in the Profession.

Some reviewers suggest that the ISLLC Standards are on "life support" and face the imminent possibility of extinction (Leithwood & Steinbach, in press)—or of "becom[ing] part of the predictable pattern of failed reforms" (Bogotch, 2002, p. 504), although in general that position has fewer subscribers than the "domination" hypothesis outlined below. Others have questioned the penetration of the Standards into the practice of school leadership (Boeckmann & Dickinson, 2001) or whether the Standards can be successful absent other important reform efforts (Creighton, 2002). Most of the critical analysis, however, maintains that the Standards are insinuating themselves deeply into the heart of the profession, "advanc[ing] certain points of view" (Hess, 2003, p. 15), and, consequently, pulling school administration in what the critics contend are unhealthy directions. Although, as noted throughout the paper, different critics see the Standards promoting nearly opposite points of view, and taking the profession in nearly opposite directions (e.g., constructivist psychology vs. industrial psychology; social justice vs. management).

Again, we begin with the intentions and the viewpoints of the Consortium. The Standards and the strategy employed to bring them to life in the profession are unabashedly about influencing the complexion of educational leadership, of moving the profession in certain directions—directions that should be fairly clear by this point in the chronicle. The narrative outlined earlier about changing the calculus of the profession from management to learning lays this out quite nicely. To the charge of attempting to exert influence, we would plead guilty. To the charge of shifting the profession in unhealthy directions, we would demur.

Part of the criticism here centers on what is perceived by some as an effort to surreptitiously sneak the Standards into play and by others, conversely, as an attempt to marshal

a powerful force to run roughshod over the profession. The other part of the analysis focuses on the use of the strategies to move the Standards into the limelight. Here the critique addresses ISLLC's use of various policy and professional leverage points "to push" the Standards.

On the first issue above, discussions, most often verbally rather than in print, hold that the Standards simply appeared out of thin air. That members of the profession woke up one day, peered up from their workbenches, and found themselves enmeshed in a web of confining expectations, or to be more accurate a new web of expectations since it is difficult to imagine that the ISLLC Standards are more confining than the existing licensure and certification bands that hold the profession. Equally sinister motives are attributed to ISLLC by colleagues who see in the Consortium a large bureaucratic enterprise with its boot on the throat of the profession (English, 2001; Foster, 2002).

A few points of clarification here might prove useful. First, ISLLC is a product of the profession. It was created by the profession writ large (i.e., the NPBEA) and the ten professional associations with the closest ties to school leadership, including all those representing professors of school administration. Second, ISLLC employed a profession-driven model to create the Standards (Gronn, 2002). Each of the associations was heavily involved in the development of the Standards and each has signed off on the product twice, as individual organizations and as members of the NPBEA team. Third, at its zenith, ISLLC had a total of one and a half employees (an Executive Director and a half-time secretary) and a yearly budget of approximately $250,000 for three years. Currently, and for the last five years as well, there is no paid staff. There is no physical home. There is no budget. These are hardly the defining characteristics of a bureaucracy. The Consortium sees the issue here differently, you will not be surprised to learn. The Standards is a set of ideas that has spread extensively and deeply because

it has widespread professional support and because the research base and values infrastructure outlined earlier are seen as providing a much needed framework to reorient the work of educators in the profession toward advancing the educational well being of youngsters.

More informed critique of the Standards revolves around the second topic outlined above—ISLLC's deliberate use of government-grounded, professional-based, and market-anchored strategies to weave the Standards into the fabric of the profession, as well as the unintended negative consequences of engaging these potentially combustible mechanisms. Criticism is directed at both the employment of the strategies (e.g., the use of program accreditation) and the content of the implementation (e.g., the ISLLC indicators). For example, the newly deployed SLLA examination being used in an expanding number of states (13 currently, with 6 or 7 others in the pipeline) in conjunction with initial administrator licensure has been critiqued from both the right and the left. Specifically, Hess (2003) is concerned because he believes that the "State [sic] Leaders Licensure Assessment is designed to ensure they [candidates] hold professionally sanctioned values and attitudes" (p. 1). English (2001) finds fault with the SLLA because it is constructed on what he holds to be an inadequate platform and because it promotes standardization in the profession. On the left, Anderson (2001) holds that the new ISLLC examination "enforces a narrow utilitarian conception of administration" (p. 203). In a similar vein, ISLLC's quest to reshape the field by rebuilding preparation program accreditation (through NCATE) with raw material from the Standards is viewed disapprovingly by some (English, in Creighton & Young, 2003). So too, ISLLC's use of market mechanisms in the preparation program area to expand the reach of the Standards has been criticized by English (2003) for challenging the monopoly position enjoyed by universities, for "wrest[ing] control of

preparation programs from the universities and colleges where it has historically been located" (p. 5).

While discussion of these points merits extended analysis that is beyond the scope of this article, a few general comments are in order. On the larger issue of the design strategy, we restate that from the outset the objective of ISLLC has been to yoke the Standards to important leverage points for change. The goal has been to generate a critical mass of energy to move school administration out of its 100-year orbit and to reposition the profession around leadership for learning. On this front, there is evidence that the Consortium's plan has enjoyed considerable success. At the same time, the jury is still out on the impact of the struggle to recenter the profession. Indeed, the question has gone largely uninvestigated (Gronn, 2002), although, as noted herein, there seems to be no shortage of perspectives on what analysts expect might happen.

On the more targeted issue, that is, whether the use of particular leverage points (e.g., the licensure examination) are strengthening the profession or not, we can only report that the ISLLC team reads the narrative somewhat differently than do some of the critical reviewers. For example, the Consortium sees the assessment doing exactly what it set out to do: (1) replacing a bankrupt, 200-item, multiple-choice examination with almost no roots in learning or leadership with a comprehensive, learned-anchored, performance-based assessment that is crafted by and evaluated by school leaders; (2) helping ensure that newly-minted leaders are able to influence school operations from a base of knowledge that is connected to important outcomes for youngsters; and (3) encouraging preparation programs to recast their work consistent with the perspectives (e.g., the Standards) that support the examination (see Darling-Hammond, 1988, on this final point).

Conclusion

Formal work on the ISLLC Standards began in mid-1994. They were approved in final form at the end of 1996. Since that time, they have exerted considerable pull on the profession of school administration, considerably more than almost anyone could have anticipated. Part of this influence can be attributed to timing. A 20-year struggle beginning with the first studies of productive schools and effective leaders had positioned the profession to accept the mantle of leadership for learning. Concomitantly, a related 20-year struggle to answer the charge thrown down by Greenfield in 1975 about a profession unhinged from its moral foundation had produced a fraternity of sentiment about the value-based dimensions of administrative work. Part of the influence can also be traced to the fact that the ISLLC strategy of standards-driven reform was isomorphic with the larger school reform agenda in play in the U.S. Additional variance can be attributed to the use of a broad-based, inclusive, professionally anchored strategy of crafting the Standards. Still more of the impact can be connected to an explicit and quite pro-active plan to bring the Standards to life. And, of course, when all is said and done, much of the influence can be traced to the appeal of the vision embedded in the standards, a vision of a profession rooted in learning and committed to the well being of youngsters and their families.

Notes

1. Most of the citations to my own work here, whether alone or with colleagues, contain, or are, comprehensive reviews of the scholarship of others. Thus, they open the door to the full array of scholarly work on which the Standards are scaffolded.

2. Throughout, I attempt to differentiate the literature that informed the work of the ISLLC team in developing the Standards from, on occasion, more recent updates of concepts under discussion.

3. The process was considerably less linear than is conveyed herein. That is, answers to key questions were developed on parallel tracks.

Table 1: A Typical Masters of School Administration Program

- school business administration
- school personnel administration
- school facilities
- supervision of employees
- pupil personnel administration

Management

- research methods statistics (psychology)
- school community relations and/or politics of education (political science)
- organizational theory (sociology)
- school finance and/or economics of education (economics)
- qualitative methods (anthropology)
- history and/or philosophy of education (history, philosophy)

Behavioral Sciences

Table 2: The ISLLC Principles and Standards

Principles

- Standards should reflect the centrality of student learning.
- Standards should acknowledge the changing role of the school leader.
- Standards should recognize the collaborative nature of school leadership.
- Standards should be high, upgrading the quality of the profession.
- Standards should inform performance-based systems of assessment and evaluation of school leaders.
- Standards should be integrated and coherent.
- Standards should be predicated on the concepts of access, opportunity, and empowerment for all members of the school community.

Standards

- A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.
- A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
- A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Table 2 (continued)

- A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.
- A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
- A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

References

Anderson, G. L. (1990, February). Toward a critical constructionist approach to school administration: Invisibility, legitimation, and the study of non-events. Educational Administration Quarterly, 26(1), 38-59.

Anderson, G. L. (2001, July-September). Disciplining leaders: A critical discourse analysis of the ISLLC National Examination and performance standards in educational administration. International Journal of Leadership in Education, 4(3), 199-216.

Anderson, G. L., Creighton, T., Dantley, M., English, F., Furman, G., Gronn, P., & Marshall, C. (2002, Spring). Problematizing the ISLLC Standards and exam. AERA Division A Newsletter (http://www.aera.net/divisions/a/anews/spring02.htm).

Barth, R. S. (1988). School: A community of leaders. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Building a professional culture in schools (pp. 129-147). New York: Teachers College Press.

Bates, R. J. (1984). Toward a critical practice of educational administration. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice (pp. 260-274). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Beck, L. G. (1994). Reclaiming educational administration as a caring profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

Beck, L. G., & Murphy, J. (1992, August). Searching for a robust understanding of the principalship. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28(3), 387-396.

Beck, L., & Murphy, J. (1993). Understanding the principalship: Metaphorical themes 1920s-1990s. New York: Teachers College Press.

Beck, L. G., & Murphy, J. (1994). Ethics in educational leadership programs: An expanding role. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin/Sage.

Beck, L. G., & Murphy, J. (1996). The four imperatives of a successful school. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin/Sage.

Beck, L. G., Murphy, J., & Associates. (1997). Ethics in educational administration programs: Emerging models. University Park, CA: University Council for Educational Administration.

Boeckmann, M. E., & Dickinson, G. B. (2001, Spring). Leadership: Values and performance. Education, 121(3), 494-497.

Bogotch, I. E. (2002, September). "Enmeshed in the work": The educative power of developing standards. Journal of School Leadership, 12(5), 503-525.

Boyan, N. J. (1963). Common and specialized learning for administrators and supervisors: Some problems and issues. In D. J. Leu & H. C. Rudman (Eds.), Preparation programs for school administrators: Common and specialized learnings (pp. 1-23). East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., Cocking, R. R. (Eds.) (2000) How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Button, H. W. (1966). Doctrines of administration: A brief history. Educational Administration Quarterly, 2(3), 216-224.

Callahan, R. E. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Callahan, R. E., & Button, H. W. (1964). Historical change of the role of the man in the organization: 1865-1950. In D. E. Griffiths (Ed.), Behavioral science and educational administration (Sixty-third NSSE yearbook, Part II, pp. 73-92). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, R. F., Fleming, T., Newell, L. J., & Bennion, J. W. (1987). A history of thought and practice in educational administration. New York: Teachers College Press.

Capper, C. & Young, M. (forthcoming). Educational leaders for social justice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cooper, B. S., & Boyd, W. L. (1987). The evolution of training for school administrators. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training (pp. 3-27). Albany: SUNY Press.

Creighton, T. (2002, September). Standards for education administration preparation programs: Okay, but don't we have the cart before the horse. Journal of School Leadership, 12(5), 526-551.

Creighton, T., & Young, M. (2003). A conversation with Fenwick English: Standards without standardization. NCPEA Educational Leadership Review, 4(1), 33-36.

Culbertson, J. A. (1964). The preparation of administrators. In D. E. Griffiths (Ed.), Behavioral science in educational administration (Sixty-third NSSE yearbook, Part II, pp. 303-330). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Culbertson, J. A. (1965). Trends and issues in the development of a science of administration. In Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, Perspectives on Educational Administration and the Behavioral Sciences (pp. 3-22). Eugene: University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration.

Culbertson, J. A., & Farquhar, R. H. (1971), April). Preparing educational leaders: Content in administration preparation. UCEA Newsletter, 12(3), 8-11.

Dantley, M. & Cambron-McCabe, N. (2001, April). Licensure of Ohio school administrators and social justice concerns. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1988). Policy and professionalism. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Building a professional culture in schools (pp. 55-77) New York: Teachers College Press.

Desimone, L. M., Porter, A. C., Garet, M. S., Yoon, K. S., & Birman, B. F. (2002, Summer). Effects of professional development on teacher's instruction: Results from a three year longitudinal study. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24(2), 81-112.

Donaldson, G. A. (2001). Cultivating leadership in schools: Connecting people, purpose, and practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Donmoyer, R., & Scheurich, J. (Eds.). The knowledge base in educational administration: Multiple perspectives. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Edmonds, R. R. (1979, March-April). Some schools work. Social Policy, 9(5), 28-32.

Ellis, A. B. (1975, February). Success and failure: A summary of findings and recommendations for improving elementary reading in Massachusetts city schools. Watertown, MA: Educational Research Corporation.

Elmore, R. F. (1990, September). Reinventing school leadership (pp. 62-65) [Working memo prepared for the Reinventing School Leadership Conference]. Cambridge, MA: National Center for Educational Leadership.

Elmore, R. F. (1991, April). Teaching, learning and organization: School restructuring and the recurring dilemmas of reform: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Elmore, R. F. (1996, March). Staff development and instructional improvement: Community District 2, New York City (Draft). Paper prepared for the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Elmore, R. F. (2000, Winter). Rebuilding a new structure for school leadership. Washington, DC: The Albert Shanker Institute.

Elmore, R. F. (2003). Accountability and capacity. In M. Carnoy, R. F. Elmore, & L. S. Siskin (Eds.), High schools and the new accountability (pp. 195-209). New York: Routledge.

English, F. (2000). Psst! What does one call a set of non-empirical beliefs required to be accepted on faith and enforced by authority? [Answer: A religion, aka the ISLLC Standards]. International Journal of Leadership in Education, 3(2), 159-167.

English, F. W. (2001, April). The epistemological foundations of professional practice: Do they matter? The case for the ISLLC Standards and the National Exam for Administrative Licensure. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle.

English, F. W. (2003, Spring). "Functional foremanship" and the virtue of historical amnesia: The AASA, the ELCC Standards, and the reincarnation of scientific management in educational preparation programs for profit. Teaching in Educational Administration, 10(1), 1, 5-6.

Erickson, D. A. (1977). An overdue paradigm shift in educational administration, or how can we get that idiot off the freeway. In L. L. Cunningham, W. G. Hack, & R. O. Nystrand (Eds.) Educational administration: The developing decades (pp. 114-143). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Evans, R. (1991, April). Ministrative insight: Educational administration as pedagogic practice. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Evertson, C., & Murphy, J. (1992). Beginning with classrooms: Implications for restructuring schools. In H. H. Marshall (Ed.), Redefining student learning. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Farquhar, R. H. (1968, October). The humanities and educational administration: Rationales and recommendations. Journal of Educational Administration, 6(2), 97-115.

Fay, C. (1992). Empowerment through leadership: In the teachers' voice. In C. Livingston (Ed.,). Teachers as leaders: Evolving roles (pp, 57-90). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Forsyth, P. B. (1999). The work of UCEA. In J. Murphy & P. B. Forsyth (Eds.), Educational Administration: A decade of reform (pp. 71-92). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.

Foster W. (2003, April). National standards and local curriculum. Paper proposal prepared for the American Educational Research Association. Chicago.

Foster, W. P. (1984). Toward a critical theory of educational administration. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), Leadership and organizational culture: New perspective on administrative theory and practice (pp. 240-259). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Foster, W. P. (1986). Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration. Buffalo: Prometheus.

Furman, G., & English, F. (2002, September). Guest editors' introduction: Can leadership be legislated? Journal of school leadership, 12(5), 476-479.

Gault, A., & Murphy, J. (1987, Winter). The implications of high expectations for bilingual students. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 7(4), 301-317.

Getzels, J. W. (1977). Educational administration twenty years later, 1954-1974. In L. L. Cunningham, W. G. Hack, & R. O. Nystrand (Eds.), Educational administration: The developing decades (pp. 3-24). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Goldhammer, K. (1983, Summer). Evolution in the profession. Educational Administration Quarterly, 19(3), 249-272.

Grace, A. G. (1946). The professional preparation of school personnel. In N. B. Henry (Ed.), Changing conceptions in educational administration (Forty-fifth NSSE yearbook, Part II, pp. 176-182). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Greenfield, T. B. (1975). Theory about organization. A new perspective and its implications for schools. In M. G. Hughes (Ed.,) Administering education: International challenge, (pp. 71-99). London: Athlone.

Greenfield, T. B. (1988). The decline and fall of science in educational administration. In D. E. Griffiths, R. T. Stout, P. B. Forsyth (Eds.), Leaders for America's schools (pp. 131-159). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Greenfield, W. D. (1995). Toward a theory of school administration: The centrality of leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 31(1), 61-85.

Gregg, R. T. (1960). Administration. In C. W. Harris (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational research (3rd ed., pp. 19-24). New York: MacMillan.

Gregg, R. T. (1969). Preparation of administrators. In R. L. Ebel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational research (4th ed., pp. 993-1004). London: MacMillan.

Griffiths, D. E. (1957). Toward a theory of administrative behavior. In R. F. Campbell & R. T. Gregg (Eds.), Administrative behavior in education (pp. 354-390). New York: Harper.

Griffiths, D. E. (1979, Fall). Intellectual turnout in educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 15(3), 43-65.

Griffiths, D. E. (1988). Educational administration: Reform PDQ or RIP (Occasional paper, no. 8312). Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

Griffiths, D. E., Stout, R. T., & Forsyth, P. B. (1988). Leaders for America's schools: The report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Gronn, P. (2002, September). Designer leadership: The emerging global adoption of preparation standards. Journal of School Leadership, 12(5), 552-578.

Hallinger, P., Leithwood, K., & Murphy, J. (Eds.). (1993) A cognitive perspective on educational administration. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1982). The superintendent's role in promoting instructional leadership. Administrator's Notebook, 30(6), 1-4.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985, November). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. Elementary School Journal, 86(2), 217-247.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1986). The social context of effective schools. American Journal of Education, 94(3), 328-355.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1987). Instructional leadership in the school context. In William Greenfield (Ed.), Instructional leadership: Problems, issues, and controversies. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Halpin, A. W. (1957). A paradigm for research on administrative behavior. In R. F. Campbell & R. T. Gregg (Eds.), Administrative behavior in education (pp. 155-199). New York: Harper.

Halpin, A. W. (1960). Ways of knowing. In R. F. Campbell & J. M. Lipham (Eds.), Administrative theory as a guide to action (pp. 3-20). Chicago: University of Chicago Midwest Administration Center.

Harlow, J. G. (1962). Purpose-defining: The central function of the school administrator. In J. A. Culbertson & S. P. Hencley (Eds.), Preparing administrators: New perspectives (pp. 61-71). Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Hart, B., & Risley, T. R. (1995). Meaningful differences in the everyday experiences of young American children. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Hencley, S. P. (1962). Forces shaping the new perspective. In J. A. Culbertson & S. P. Hencley (Eds.), Preparing administrators: New perspectives (pp. 1-8). Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Hess, F. M. (2003, January). A license to lead? A new leadership agenda for America's schools. Progressive Policy Institute.

Hills, J. (1975, Autumn). The preparation of administrators: Some observations from the "firing line." Educational Administration Quarterly, 11(3), 1-20.

Huberman, M. (1993). The models of the independent artisan in teachers' professional relations. In J. W. Little & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), Teachers work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts (pp. 9-50). New York: Teachers College Press.

Johnson, S. M. (1989). Schoolwork and its reform. In J. Hannaway & R. Crowson (Eds.), The politics of reforming school administration (the 1989 Yearbook of the Politics of Education Association; pp. 95-112). New York: Falmer.

Immegart, G. L. (1977). The study of educational administration, 1954-1974. In L. L. Cunningham, W. G. Hack, & R. O. Nystrand (Eds.), Educational administration: The developing decades (pp. 298-328). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Keeler, C. M. (2002, September). Exploring the validity of standards for school administration preparation. Journal of School Leadership, 12(5), 579-602.

Larson, C. L., & Murtadha, K. (2002). Leadership for social justice. In J. Murphy (Ed.), The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century (pp. 134-161). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lashway, L. (1998, Fall). Standards for administrators. Research Roundup, 15(1) [Eugene, OR; ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.]

Latham, A. S., & Pearlman, M. A. (1999, September). From standards to licensure: Developing an authentic assessment for school principals. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 13(3), 245-262.

Leithwood, K. & Steinbach, R. (in press). Toward a second generation of school leadership standards. In P. Hallinger (Ed.), Global trends in school leadership. Lise, The Netherlands: Swets & Zetlinger.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1999). Teachers—transforming their world and their work. New York: Teachers College Press.

Little, J. W. (1987). Teachers as colleagues. In V. Richardson-Kochler (Ed.), Educators' handbook: A research perspective (pp. 491-518). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Little, J. W., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1993a). Conclusion. In J. W. Little & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), Teachers work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts (185-190). New York: Teachers College Press.

Little, J. W. & McLaughlin, M. W. (1993b). Introduction: Perspectives on cultures and contexts of teaching. In J. W. Little & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), Teachers work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts (p. 1-8). New York: Teachers College Press.

Lotto, L. S. (1983, Winter). Believing is seeing. Organization Theory Dialogue, 3(1), 6-26.

Louis, K. S., & Murphy, J. (1994). The evolving role of the principal: Some concluding thoughts. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts (pp. 265-281) Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Marshall, C., & McCarthy, M. (2002, September). School leadership reforms: Filtering social justice through dominant discourse. Journal of School Leadership, 12(5), 480-502.

Marshall, H. H. (1990, Spring). Beyond the workplace metaphor: The classroom as a learning setting. Theory into Practice, 24(2), 94-101.

Marshall, R., & Tucker, M. (1992). Thinking for a living: Work, skills, and the future of the American economy. New York: Basic Books.

McCarthy, M. M., Kuh, G. D., Newell, L. J., & Iacona, C. M. (1988). Under scrutiny: The educational administration professoriate. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

McNeil, L. (1988, January). Contradictions of control, Part 1: Administrators and teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(5), 333-339.

Murnane, R. J., & Levy, F. (1996). Teaching the new basic skills: Principles for educating children to thrive in a changing economy. New York: The Free Press.

Murphy, J. (1988a, Spring). Equity as student opportunity to learn: Findings and implications. Theory Into Practice, 27(2), 145-151.

Murphy, J. (1988b, Summer). Methodological, measurement, and conceptual problems in the study of administrator instructional leadership. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 10(2), 117-139.

Murphy, J. (1990a). The educational reform movement of the 1980s: A comprehensive analysis. In J. Murphy (Ed.), The reform of American public education in the 1980s: Perspectives and cases (pp. 3-55). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Murphy, J. (1990b, April-June). Improving the preparation of school administrators: The National Policy Board's story. The Journal of Educational Policy, 5(2), 181-186.

Murphy, J. (1990c). Preparing school administrators for the twenty-first century: The reform agenda. In B. Mitchell & L. L. Cunningham (Eds.), Educational leadership and changing contexts of families, communities, and schools (pp. 232-251). (the 1990 NSSE yearbook). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Murphy, J. (1990d). Principal instructional leadership. In L. S. Lotto & P. W. Thurston (Eds.), Advances in educational administration: Changing perspectives on the school. (Volume 1, Part B; pp. 163-200). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Murphy, J. (1990e). The reform of school administration: Pressures and calls for change. In J. Murphy (Ed.), The reform of American public education in the 1980s: Perspectives and cases (pp. 277-303). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Murphy, J. (1991a, Spring). The effects of the educational reform movement on departments of educational leadership. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 13(1), 49-65.

Murphy, J. (1991b). Restructuring schools: Capturing and assessing the phenomena. New York: Teachers College Press.

Murphy, J. (1992a). Effective schools: Legacy and future directions. In D. Reynolds & P. Cuttance (Eds.), School effectiveness research, policy and practice (pp. 164-170). London: Cassells.

Murphy, J. (1992b). The landscape of leadership preparation: Reframing the education of school administrators. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. (1992c). School effectiveness and school restructuring: Contributions to educational improvement. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 3(2), 90-109.

Murphy, J. (1993a). Alternative designs: New Directions. In J. Murphy (Ed.), Preparing tomorrow's school leaders: Alternative designs (pp. 225-253). University Park, PA: University Council for Educational Administration.

Murphy, J. (1993b, May). Restructuring schooling: The equity infrastructure. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 4(2), 111-130.

Murphy, J. (1994a, December). The changing role of the superintendency in restructuring districts in Kentucky. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 5(4), 349-375.

Murphy, J. (1994b). The changing role of the teacher. In M. J. O'Hair & S. J. Odell (Eds.), Educating teachers for leadership and change (pp. 311-323) (Teacher Education Yearbook III). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. (1994c). Transformational change and the evolving role of the principalship: Early empirical evidence. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts (pp. 20-53). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. (1995a, Summer). Insights on "the context of full inclusion" from a non-special educator. The Journal of Special Education, 29(2), 209-211.

Murphy, J. (1995b). Restructuring in Kentucky: The changing role of the superintendent and district office. In K. A. Leithwood (Ed.), Effective school district leadership: Transforming politics into education. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Murphy, J. (1996). The privatization of schooling: Problems and possibilities. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. (1999a). The quest for a center: Notes on the state of the profession of educational leadership. Columbia, MO: University Council for Educational Administration.

Murphy, J. (1999b). The new consumerism: Evolving market dynamics in the institutional dimension of schooling. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Handbook of research on educational administration (2nd ed., pp. 405-419). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Murphy, J. (1999c). Reconnecting teaching and school administration: A call for a unified profession. UCEA Review, 40(2), 1-3, 6-7.

Murphy, J. (2000, February). Governing America's schools: The shifting playing field. Teachers College Record, 102(1), 57-84.

Murphy, J. (Ed.). (2002a). The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century (National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook, Vol. 101A). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Murphy, J. (2002b, April). Reculturing the Profession of educational leadership: New Blueprints. Educational Administration Quarterly, 38(3), 176-191.

Murphy, J. (2004). Leadership for literacy, prek-3: Research-anchored practice. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J., & Beck, L. G. (1995). School-based management as school reform: Taking stock. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.Murphy, J. & Datnow, A. (2003a). Leadership lessons from comprehensive school reform designs. In J. Murphy & A. Datnow (Eds.), Leadership for school reform: Lessons from comprehensive school reform designs (pp. 263-278). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. & Datnow, A. (2003b). Tracing the development of comprehensive school reform designs. In J. Murphy & A. Datnow (Eds.), Leadership for school reform: Lessons from comprehensive school reform designs (pp. 3-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J., & Forsyth, P. (Eds.). (1999). Educational leadership programs: A decade of reform. Thousand Oaks, CA, and Columbia, MO: Corwin Press and The University Council for Educational Administration.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1986, Summer). The superintendent as instructional leader: Findings from effective school districts. Journal of Educational Administration, 24(2), 213-236.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1988, February). The characteristics of instructionally effective school districts. Journal of Educational Research, 81(3), 175-181.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1989, March-April). Equity as access to learning: Curricular and instructional treatment differences. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 21(2), 129-149.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1992). The principalship in an era of transformation. Journal of Educational Administration, 30(2), 77-88.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (Eds.). (1993). Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin/Sage.

Murphy, J., & Louis, K. S. (Eds.) (1999). The handbook of research on educational administration (2nd ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Murphy, J., & Shiffman, C. (2002). Understanding and assessing charter schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Murphy, J., & Shipman, N. J. (1999, September). The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: A standards-based approach to strengthening educational leadership. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 13(3), 205-224.

Murphy, J., & Shipman, N. J. (2002). The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) story: A brief narrative. In J. Hessel & J. Holloway (Eds), A framework for school leaders: Linking the ISLLC "Standards for School Leaders" to practice (pp. 4-9). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Murphy, J., & Shipman, N. J. (2003). Developing standards for school leadership development: A process. In P. Hallinger (Ed.), The changing landscape of educational leadership development: A global perspective (pp. 69-83). Lisse, The Netherlands.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., & Lotto, L. S. (1986, November-December). Inequitable allocations of alterable learning variables in schools and classrooms. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(6), 21-26.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., & Mesa, R. P. (1985, Summer). School effectiveness: Checking progress and assumptions and developing a role for state and federal government. Teachers College Record, 86(4), 615-641.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., & Peterson, K. D. (1986). The administrative control of principals in effective school districts: The supervision and evaluation functions. The Urban Review, 18(3), 149-175.

Murphy, J., Weil, M., & McGreal, T. L. (1986, September). The basic practice model of instruction. Elementary School Journal, 87(1), 83-95.

Murphy, J., Yff, J., & Shipman, N. J. (2000, January-March). Implementation of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium standards. The International Journal of Leadership in Education, 3(1), 17-39.

Murphy, J., Beck, L. G., Crawford, M., & Hodges, A. (2001). The productive high school: Creating personalized academic communities. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J., Beck, L. G., Knapp, M. S., & Portin, B. S. (2003). KEYS and the larger school reform movement in the United States. In B. S. Portortin, L. G. Beck, M. S. Knapp, & J. Murphy (Eds.), Self-Reflective renewal in schools: Lessons from a national initiative (pp. 1-15). Norwood, NJ: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Murphy, J., Gilmer, S., Weise, R., & Page, A. (1998). Pathways to privatization in education. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., Lotto, L. S., & Miller, S. K. (1987, December). Barriers to implementing the instructional leadership role. Canadian Administrator, 27(3), 1-9.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., Peterson, K. D., & Lotto, L. S. (1987, Summer). The administrative control of principals in effective school districts. Journal of Educational Administration, 25(2), 161-192.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., Weil, M., & Mitman, A. (1983a, Fall). Instructional leadership. A conceptual framework. Planning and Changing, 14(3), 137-149.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., Weil, M., & Mitman, A. (1983b, Fall). Problems with research on educational leadership: Issues to be addressed. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 5(3), 297-305.

Murphy, J., Weil, M., Hallinger, P., & Mitman, A. (1985, Spring). School effectiveness: A conceptual framework. The Educational Forum, 49(3), 361-374.

Newlon, J. H. (1934). Educational administration as social policy. New York: Scribner.

Norton, J. (1957). The contemporary scene. In R. F. Campbell & R. T. Gregg (Eds.), Administrative Behavior in Education (pp. 41-81). New York: Harper.

Osterman, K. (200, Fall). Students' need for belonging in the school community. Review of Educational Research, 70(3), 323-367

Peterson, K. D., Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1987, February). Superintendents' perceptions of the control and coordination of the technical core operations in effective school districts. Educational Administration Quarterly, 23(1), 79-95.

Powell, A. G., Farrar, E., & Cohen, D. K. (1985). The shopping mall high school: Winners and losers in the educational marketplace. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Ralph, J. H., & Fennessey, J. (1983, June). Science or reform: Some questions about the effective schools model. Phi Delta Kappan, 64(10), 689-694.

Riehl, C. J. (2000, Spring). The principal's role in creating inclusive schools for diverse students: A review of normative, empirical, and critical literature on the practice of educational administration. Review of Educational Research, 70(1), 55-81.

Rosenshine, B. (1983, March). Teaching functions in instructional programs. Elementary School Journal, 83(4), 335-351.

Rowan, B., Bossert, S., & Dwyer, D. (1983, April). Research on effective schools: A cautionary note. Educational Researcher, 12(4), 24-31.

Sedlack, M. W., Wheeler, C. W., Pullin, D. C., & Cusick, P. A. (1986). Selling students short: Classroom bargains and academic reform in the American high school. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). Developing a relevant theory of administration. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice (pp. 275-291). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools. San Diego: Harcourt, Brace, & Jonanovich.

Shapiro, J. P., & Stefkovich, J. A. (2001). Ethical leadership in decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new profession. Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 1-22.

Silver, P. F. (1982). Administrator preparation. In H. E. Mitzel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational research (5th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 49-59). New York: Free Press.

Silver, P. F., & Spuck, D. W. (1978). Preparatory programs for educational administrators in the United States. Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Sirotnik, J. A. (1985, Spring). School effectiveness: A bandwagon in search of a tune. Educational Administration Quarterly, 21(2), 135-140.

Sizer, T. R. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Snow, C. E., Burns, M. S., & Griffin, P. (Eds.) (1998). Preventing reading difficulties in young children. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Sparks, D., & Hirshman, S. (1997). A new vision for staff development. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Starratt, R. J. (1991, May). Building a ethical school: A theory for practice in educational leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28(2), 185-202.

Stigler, J. W., & Hiebert, J. (1999). The teaching gap: Best ideas from the world's teachers for improving education in the classroom. New York: The Free Press.

Sykes, G., & Elmore, R. F. (1989). Making schools more manageable. In J. Hannaway & R. L. Crowson (Eds.), The politics of reforming school administrations (pp. 77-94). New York: Falmer Press.

Tannenbaum, R. J. (1999, September). Laying the groundwork for a licensure assessment. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 13(3), 225-244.

Teddlie, C., & Reynolds, D. (2000). The international handbook of school effectiveness research. London: Falmer.

Thomson, S. D. (1999). Causing change: The National Policy Board for Educational Administration. In J. Murphy & P. B. Forsyth (Eds.), Educational administration: A decade of reform (pp. 93-114). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.

Tyack, D. B., & Hansot, E. (1982). Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America, 1920-1980. New York: Basic Books.

Watson, B. C. (1977). Issues confronting educational administrators, 1954-1974. In L. L. Cunningham, W. G. Hack, & R. O. Nystrand (Eds.), Educational administration: The developing decades (pp. 67-94). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Webb, J., Corbett, H. D., & Wilson, B. L. (1993). Restructuring systemically for students. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts (pp. 188-215). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Weick, K. E., & McDaniel, R. R. (1989). How professional organizations work: Implications for school organization and management. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. H. Moore (Eds.), Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reforms to issues that count (pp. 330-355). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Weiler, R. (1992). The teacher as expert: A theoretical and historical examination. Albany State University of New York Press.

Young, M. D., & Liable, J. (2000, September). White racism, antiracism, and school leadership preparation. Journal of School Leadership, 10(1), 374-415.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").